

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2 and 4-8 have been amended to correct a few typographical errors.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because of insufficient antecedent basis. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kokubo (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/119562). The Examiner has rejected Claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubo in view of Kido (U.S. Patent Publication 2001/16508).

Additionally, the Examiner has objected to the title of the invention, stating that the current title is not descriptive of the invention. As indicated above, the title has been amended to be descriptive of the invention. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, the Examiner asserts that it would not be possible for the second display to be viewable while in the closed position, if the display was located on the same housing as the first display as described in the specification. However, even if the second display is located on the same housing, i.e., the second housing, as the first display, the second display can be exposed to the outside, as the second display faces toward the lower surface of the first housing when the second housing is closed on the first housing, which is described in the originally filed application on page 6, lines 9-13 and specifically shown in Fig. 4. Accordingly, it is believed the Examiner is incorrect with the rejection, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 7 under §112, second paragraph, the Examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the third housing" in line 2.

Accordingly, Claim 7 has been amended to change “the third housing” into “the second display”. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to independent Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Kokubo teaches all of the recitations in Claim 1. More specifically, the Examiner cites the operation unit 160 as anticipating the first housing including an open space, the open space having at least one opening as recited in Claim 1. However, it is believed the Examiner is incorrect.

Claim 1 recites a first housing including an open space, the open space having at least one opening and a third housing including a second display, extending in a longitudinal direction of the second housing to be accommodated in the open space to enable the third housing to rotate about the hinge axis. However, the operation unit 160 of Kokubo does not teach the open space having one opening, thereby enabling the second display of the third housing to rotate about the hinge axis. Rather, a sub-display unit 142 of Kokubo is fixedly provided on the hinge unit 140 even if the main display unit 122 rotates on the hinge unit 140 (see Figs. 1A and 1B, [0036] and [0037]). In contrast, the third housing of the present invention extends in a longitudinal direction of the second housing to be accommodated in the open space to enable the third housing to rotate about the hinge axis as recited in Claim 1, so that the second display of the third housing rotates about the hinge axis together with the first display of the second housing when the second housing is opened/closed from the first housing.

As recited in MPEP 706.02(IV), “for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly.” As Kokubo clearly does not teach a first housing including an open space, the open space having at least one opening and a third housing including a second display, extending in a longitudinal direction of the second housing to be accommodated in the open space to enable the third housing to rotate about the hinge axis, as recited in Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect in rejecting Claim 1 as being anticipated by Kokubo, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to dependent Claim 3, the Examiner asserts that Kokubo teaches all of the

recitations in Claim 3. The sub-display unit 142 and the display unit 120 of Kokubo are not integrally connected, but are separately connected, i.e., they are separate pieces (see Figs. 1A and 1B). Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to independent Claim 5, the Examiner asserts that Kokubo teaches all of the recitations in Claim 5. However, it is believed the Examiner is incorrect. Claim 5 recites a first housing including an open space, the open space having at least one opening and a second housing including a first display and a second display wherein the first display and the second display are looked upward in the same direction. However, the operation unit 160 of Kokubo does not teach the open space having one opening. In addition, in contrast to Claim 1, the display unit 120 of Kokubo includes the main display unit 122, not the sub-display unit 142 which is positioned rather at the operation unit 142. When the display unit 120 is closed, the main display unit 142 and the sub-display unit 142 are looked upward in the opposite direction, not the same direction as recited in Claim 5 (see Figs. 1A and 1B). As Kokubo clearly does not teach a first housing including an open space, the open space having at least one opening and a second housing including a first display and a second display wherein the first display and the second display are looked upward the same direction, as recited in Claim 5, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect in rejecting Claim 5 as being anticipated by Kokubo, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 5 are believed to be in condition for allowance. At least because of their dependence on Claims 1 and 5, respectively, dependent Claims 2-4 and 6-8 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely, Claims 1-8, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written in a cursive style.

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/JWK/mk